I.

## REMARKS

## STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-18 were pending in the Application. By the present amendment, Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice of disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 1, 3 and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, 1, 3, 4, 6-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (hereinafter, "Section 102(b)") as being anticipated by JP No. 03-153523 to Wakasa et al (hereinafter, "Wakasa").

Claims 2, 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (hereinafter, "Section 103(a)") as being unpatentable over Wakasa, in view of Chapman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,869,054, hereinafter, "Chapman").

Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakasa, in view of Saegusa (U.S. Pat. No. 4,882,133, hereinafter, "Saegusa").

Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections and requests reconsideration.

## II. REJECTION UNDER SECTION 102(b), WAKASA

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-15 are rejected under Section 102(b). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's contention that Wakasa anticipates claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-15 for the reasons state below:

Applicant's claim 1 has been amended and not ALL of the elements of amended claim 1 are taught in Wakasa. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a peak fine pore diameter of 2 to 20 nm, and an oil absorption of 120ml/100g or more." Support for these amendments can be found in the specification on page 11, lines 2-4 and page 19, lines 8-9.

Application No.: 10/517,463 Atty. Docket No.: SOHMELPT1012
Office action dated 10/30/2006 Customer No.: 24943

Reply dated 01/30/2007

Wakasa does not disclose the claimed elements of "A porous metal oxide material in

a flake form having ... a peak fine pore diameter of 2 to 20 nm, and an oil absorption of

120ml/100g or more." (emphasis added). There is no support provided in Wakasa for these

limitations and as affirmed by Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Wakasa is silent

about the size of the pore as claimed. Neither is the oil absorption limitation found in

Wakasa. As such, Wakasa fails to teach all the required elements of amended claim 1 and is

therefore not anticipated by Wakasa.

Dependent claims 3, 4 and 6-15 include all limitations of their respective base claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 4 and 6-15 are all allowable for at

least the same reasons as base claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4

and 6-15 under Section 102(b).

III. REJECTIONS UNDER SECTION 103(a)

Wakasa in view of Chapman

Claims 2, 5 and 16 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wakasa in view of Chapman. The elements of claim 2 have been incorporated into amended

claim 1. As such Claim 2 has been canceled.

Dependent claims 5 and 16 include all the limitations of their respective base claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 16 are allowable for at least the

same reasons described above for base claim 1, as not all the elements of these claims are

taught by the cited references as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

6 of 8

Application No.: 10/517,463 Atty. Docket No.: SOHMELPT1012
Office action dated 10/30/2006 Customer No.: 24943

Reply dated 01/30/2007

Amended claim 1 requires a "porous metal oxide material in flake form having... a

peak fine pore diameter of 2 to 20 nm, and an oil absorption of 120ml/100g or more."

(emphasis added). It has been established that Wakasa does not teach this required element.

However, Chapman further does not teach or suggest this element. Rather, Chapman teaches

a pore size of porous metal oxide particles of less than 600 angstrom and does NOT teach the

claimed pore diameter of a porous metal oxide in flake form. There is a structural difference

in such teachings in that Chapman does not disclose the size of the flake form of the material

but is describing the size of the particles of the material. It is an object of Applicant's present

invention to provide a porous metal oxide material in a flake form which can exhibit various

functions inherent in a porous material but to also overcome the problems in using porous

1 01

materials. (Application, page 4, lines 1-5). Furthermore, neither Wakasa nor Chapman teach "an oil absorption of 120ml/100g or more". Both Wakasa and Chapman fail to teach each and

every element of amended claim 1 as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 16 are allowable for at least the

same reasons as amended claim 1, as discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 16 under

Section 103(a).

Wakasa in view of Saegusa

Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wakasa in view of Saegusa.

Dependent claims 17 and 18 include all the limitations of their respective base claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17 and 18 are allowable for at least

7 of 8

Application No.: 10/517,463 Atty. Docket No.: SOHMELPT1012
Office action dated 10/30/2006 Customer No.: 24943

Reply dated 01/30/2007

the same reasons described above for base claim 1, as not all the elements of these claims are

taught by the references cited as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Similarly, as discussed above in regards to amended claim 1, Wakasa does not include all of

the claim limitations of a "porous metal oxide material in flake form having... a peak fine

pore diameter of 2 to 20 nm, and an oil absorption of 120ml/100g or more." Saegusa further

fails to provide the deficiencies of Wakasa. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that

claims 17 -18 are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 17

and 18 under Section 103(a).

IV. CONCLUSION

The above-discussed amendments and remarks are believed to place the present

Application in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding

the above amendments, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's representative at

the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 2007 /Juneko Jackson/

Otto O. Lee (Reg. No.: 37,871) Juneko Jackson (Reg. No.: 48,870) Marie G. Capuvan (Reg. No.: 52,695)

Shinae Kim-Helms (Reg. No.: 57,552) Intellectual Property Law Group LLP

Attorneys for Applicant

Contact No.: 408-286-8933

Atty Docket No.: SOHMEI.PT1012

8 of 8